

REMARKS

Claims 65-78 and 97-107 are currently pending, of which claims 65 and 97 are in independent form. Claims 65 and 97 are amended by the present response.

No new matter is added hereby.

Favorable reconsideration of the present patent application as currently constituted is respectfully requested.

Regarding the Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

In the pending Office Action, claims 65, 67-70, 89, 97 and 99 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,958,006 to Eggleston et al. (hereinafter the *Eggleston* reference) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,826,023 to Hall et al. (hereinafter the *Hall* reference).

Additionally, claims 71-73 and 100-102 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of the *Eggleston* and *Hall* references in view of Official Notice that "word processing files, audio files, and video files were all old and well known types of email attachments at the time the invention was made, and that word processing type files could be processed (displayed) by mobile devices while video files could not, due to limitations on processing capabilities at the time."

Finally, claims 66, 74-78, 98, and 103-107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of *Eggleston, Hall* and Official Notice in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,964,833 to Kikinis (hereinafter the *Kikinis* reference).

Without acquiescing in the characterization of the rejected claims and/or of the cited art provided in the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing §103(a) rejections have been overcome or otherwise rendered moot by way of the present response. Pending base claim 65 is directed to an embodiment of a method of redirecting e-mail messages and message attachments to a user of a mobile data communication device that is associated with a host system. As currently amended, the claimed method comprises, *inter alia*, receiving a configuration command from the mobile data communication device wherein the configuration command is operative to enable a preferred sender list with respect to the user. Upon receiving a data item for the user at the host system, a determination is made that the received data item is from a sender on the preferred sender list, wherein the data item includes a message attachment and an e-mail message addressed to a first address identifying a mailbox that is viewable by the user at the user's computer coupled to the

host system. Substantially identical features are also recited in base claim 97 as currently constituted.

Eggleston is directed to a virtual session based communication system for transferring data between a mobile client and a host system (i.e., a post office). See, e.g., col. 2, lines 51-65. In *Eggleston*, each virtual session for transferring data between the mobile client and the host system starts with instantiation 301 and registration 302 by the client. See FIG. 3. Responsive to these processes, a virtual session manager (VSM) facilitates registration and authentication of the client with the host server. See *Id.* *Eggleston* also discloses a prestage filter mechanism for applying user-definable filter parameters (e.g., reject, pass, or granularity filters) on data being transferred between the remote communication unit (i.e., the mobile client) and the host system. The prestage filtering may take place at the host application or at a communication server. See, e.g., col. 8, line 56 to col. 9, line 8.

Eggleston also appears to disclose a number of filtering mechanisms, e.g., based on criteria such as priority, date, size, author, or subject/keyword. See FIGS. 5 and 6. While a client can change the filter settings locally, and such changes are communicated to the communication server as soon as they are made or as soon as a virtual session is established, there is no

teaching or suggestion with respect to maintaining a preferred sender list that can be selectively enabled by a command from the mobile client. See col. 9, lines 44-54. Applicant respectfully submits that a "synchronization" of filter settings between the client and the communication server is not the same as enabling or initiating a filter that exists on the server irrespective of whether a corresponding filter also exists on the client, as set forth in the embodiments currently claimed by Applicant.

The foregoing deficiency of *Eggleston* is not cured by the secondary art applied in the present Office Action. Irrespective of the Office Action's characterization of the *Hall* reference as teaching encapsulation of electronic mail, Applicant respectfully submits that *Hall* is not at all helpful at least with respect to the feature of receiving a configuration command from the mobile data communication device wherein the configuration command is operative to enable a preferred sender list for a particular user. Likewise, while *Kikinis* appears to disclose that a received email is checked for a match against a subscriber list (see FIG. 3A, steps 216 and 217), there is no teaching or suggestion regarding receipt of a configuration command for enabling a preferred sender list as set forth in Applicant's present claims.

Based on at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the applied art of record, either alone or in any reasonable combination, does not teach or suggest all the limitations of pending base claims 65 and 97. Claims 65 and 97 are therefore believed to be allowable over the art of record. Dependent claims 66-78 depending from claim 65 and dependent claims 98-107 depending from claim 97 are also believed to be allowable over the art of record at least for the same reasons.

Reservation of Rights

Notwithstanding the foregoing, Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as, e.g., the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of the present claims, the right to challenge any Official Notice(s) taken, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections of the present Office Action, or the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 or otherwise.

Fee Statement

Compared to the highest number previously paid for, the total number of claims and the number of independent claims have not increased. A petition for a THREE-month extension of time is being made. Additionally, Applicant is filling herewith a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) of the instant patent application. Accordingly, payment via electronic filing is being authorized in the applicable amount(s). Applicant believes no additional fees are due for the filing of this Submission. If any additional fees are due and/or any overpayments have been made, however, please charge and/or credit our deposit account (Deposit Account No. 03-1130).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In view of the fact that none of the art of the record, whether considered alone or in combination discloses, anticipates or suggests the present embodiments, as now defined by the independent claims, and in further view of the above amendments and/or remarks, reconsideration of the Action and allowance of the present patent application are respectfully requested and are believed to be appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 29, 2010

/Shreen Danamraj/
Shreen K. Danamraj
Registration No. 41,696

THE DANAMRAJ LAW GROUP, P.C.
Premier Place, Suite 1450
5910 North Central Expressway
Dallas, Texas 75206
Tel (214) 750-5666
Fax (214) 363-8177